

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant amends the Application and seeks reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In this Response, Applicant amends claims 19-23 and 26-27. Applicant does not cancel or add any new claims. Accordingly, claims 1-28 remain pending in the Application.

I. Claim Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Patent Office alleges that it is unclear to which “video data” recited in claim 19 that the recitation of “the video data” in claim 26 refers to. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, at least in view of the amendments to claims 19 and 26.

Applicant has amended claims 19 and 26 to recite the terms “first video data” to clarify claim 26. Applicant submits that such clarification renders claim 26 definite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 11-12, 19, 22, and 26

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 11-12, 19, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over European Patent No. EP 1,158,788 issued to Machida et al. (“*Machida*”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0028225 filed by Dawson et al. (“*Dawson*”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

To render a claim obvious, the cited references must disclose each and every element of the rejected claim (*see* MPEP § 2143). Among other elements, claim 1 defines an apparatus for display of video data from a plurality of video sources comprising “a plurality of video channels configured to be coupled to different video sources” and “a plurality of video decoders coupled to the plurality of video channels, each video decoder coupled to a different one of the plurality of video channels.”

Application No.: 10/699,311
Reply to Office Action mailed on 7/8/2009
Reply dated 8/17/2009

Applicant submits that the combination of *Machida* and *Dawson* fails to disclose at least these elements of claim 1.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office admits that *Machida* “does not specifically disclose a plurality of video sources,” “a plurality of video channels,” and “a plurality of video decoders” (Paper No./Mail Date 20090702, pages 3-4). Moreover, in reviewing *Machida* Applicant is unable to discern any sections of *Machida* disclosing such elements. Therefore, *Machida* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. The Patent Office relies on the disclosure in *Dawson* to cure the defects of *Machida*; however, Applicant submits that *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Dawson was published on February 3, 2005 and filed on July 29, 2003, which is the earliest effective date of *Dawson* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant submits a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 declaring that the inventor, James C. Fye, conceived and **actually** reduced the invention defined by claims 1-28 to practice prior to the earliest effective date of *Dawson* (i.e., July 29, 2003). Therefore, because Applicant conceived and actually reduced the invention defined by claims 1-28 to practice prior to the earliest effective date of *Dawson*, *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Because *Machida* does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 and *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claim 1 is not obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1.

Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1 and include all of the elements thereof. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 4-5 are not obvious over *Machida* and that *Dawson* is not prior art at least for the same reasons as claim 1, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-5.

Referring to the rejection of claims 7-8, 11-12, 19, 22, and 26, Applicants submit that claims 7-8, 11-12, 19, 22, and 26 each recite elements similar to the elements recited in claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, Applicants submit that the discussion above regarding *Machida* failing to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 and *Dawson* not being prior art is equally applicable to

similar elements recited in claims 7-8, 11-12, 19, 22, and 26. Therefore, claims -8, 11-12, 19, 22, and 26 are not obvious over *Machida* and *Dawson* is not prior art at least for the same reasons as claim 1, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-8, 11-12, 19, 22, and 26.

B. Claims 2-3 and 20-21

Claims 2-3 and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Machida* in view of *Dawson* and U.S. Patent No. 6,487,719 issued to Itoh (“*Itoh*”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 20-21 depend from independent claim 19, and include all of the elements of their respective independent claims. In rejecting claims 2-3 and 20-21, the Patent Office characterizes *Machida* and *Dawson* similar to the rejection of claims 1 and 19 discussed above. Applicant has discussed the failure of *Machida* to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1 and 19, and that *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and respectfully submits that such discussion is equally applicable to claims 2-3 and 20-21 because of their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 19. The Patent Office relies on the disclosure in *Itoh* to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*; however, Applicant submits that *Itoh* fails to cure such defects.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not cite *Itoh* as teaching or suggesting “a plurality of video channels configured to be coupled to different video sources” and “a plurality of video decoders coupled to the plurality of video channels, each video decoder coupled to a different one of the plurality of video channels,” as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 19. Moreover, in reviewing *Itoh* Applicant is unable to discern any sections of *Itoh* teaching or suggesting such elements. Therefore, *Itoh* fails to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*.

The failure of the combination of the cited references to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 2-3 and 20-21 is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Therefore, claims 2-3 and 20-

21 are not obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-3 and 20-21.

C. Claims 6, 9-10, 14, and 27-28

Claims 6, 9-10, 14, and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Machida* in view of *Dawson* and U.S. Patent No. 5,883,676 issued to Miyazaki et al. (“*Miyazaki*”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 6, 9-10, and 27-28 depend from independent claims 1, 7, and 19, respectively, and include all of the elements of their respective independent claims. In rejecting claims 6, 9-10, and 27-28 the Patent Office characterizes *Machida* and *Dawson* similar to the rejection of claims 1, 7, and 19 discussed above. Applicant has discussed the failure of *Machida* to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 7, and 19, and that *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and respectfully submits that such discussion is equally applicable to claims 6, 9-10, and 27-28 because of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 7, and 19. The Patent Office relies on the disclosure in *Miyazaki* to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*; however, Applicant submits that *Miyazaki* fails to cure such defects.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not cite *Miyazaki* as disclosing “a plurality of video channels configured to be coupled to different video sources” and “a plurality of video decoders coupled to the plurality of video channels, each video decoder coupled to a different one of the plurality of video channels,” as recited in claim 6 (via claim 1) and similarly recited in claims 9-10 (via claim 7) and claims 27-28 (via claim 19). Moreover, in reviewing *Miyazaki* Applicant is unable to discern any sections in *Miyazaki* disclosing such elements. Therefore, *Miyazaki* fails to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*.

The failure of the cited references to disclose each and every element of claims 6, 9-10, and 27-28 is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Therefore, claims 6, 9-10, and 27-28 are not obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 9-10, and 27-28.

D. Claim 11

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Machida* in view of *Dawson* and U.S. Patent No. 6,118,498 issued to Reitmeier (“*Reitmeier*”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 13 depends from claim 7 and includes all of the elements thereof. In rejecting claim 13, the Patent Office characterizes *Machida* and *Dawson* similar to the rejection of claim 7 discussed above. Applicant has discussed the failure of *Machida* to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 7, and that *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and respectfully submits that such discussion is equally applicable to claim 13 because of its dependency from claim 7. The Patent Office relies on the disclosure in *Reitmeier* to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*; however, Applicant submits that *Reitmeier* fails to cure such defects.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not cite *Reitmeier* as disclosing “receiving video data from each of the plurality of video sources via a plurality of video channels” and “decoding, with a plurality of video decoders, at least a portion of the video data received from the plurality of video channels, each video decoder receiving video data via a different video channel” as recited in claim 13 (via claim 7). Moreover, in reviewing *Reitmeier* Applicant is unable to discern any sections in *Reitmeier* teaching or suggesting such elements. Therefore, *Reitmeier* fails to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*.

The failure of the cited references to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 13 is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Therefore, claim 13 is not obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13.

E. Claim 14

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Machida* in view of *Dawson*, *Reitmeier*, and *Miyazaki*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

To render a claim obvious, the cited references must disclose each and every element of the rejected claim (*see* MPEP § 2143). Among other elements, claim 14 defines a method comprising

the steps of: “receiving second video data from a second video source at a second video decoder via a second video channel,” “decoding, via the first video decoder, a first frame of the first video data,” “decoding, via the second video decoder, a second frame of the second video data,” “inputting the first decoded frame into a first video processing pipeline via a non-blocking switch network,” and “inputting the second decoded frame into a second video processing pipeline via the non-blocking switch network.” Applicant submits that the combination of *Machida*, *Dawson*, *Reitmeier*, and *Miyazaki* fails to teach or suggest at least these elements of claim 14.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office admits that *Machida* does not specifically disclose the steps of: “receiving second video data from a second video source at a second video decoder via a second video channel,” “decoding, via the first video decoder, a first frame of the first video data,” “decoding, via the second video decoder, a second frame of the second video data,” “inputting the first decoded frame into a first video processing pipeline via a non-blocking switch network,” and “inputting the second decoded frame into a second video processing pipeline via the non-blocking switch network,” as recited in claim 14 (see Paper No./Mail Date 20090702, pages 10-11). Moreover, in reviewing *Machida* Applicant is unable to discern any sections of *Machida* disclosing such elements. Therefore, *Machida* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 14. The Patent Office relies on the disclosure in *Dawson* to cure the defects of *Machida*; however, Applicant submits that *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Dawson was published on February 3, 2005 and filed on July 29, 2003, which is the earliest effective date of *Dawson* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant submits a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 declaring that the inventor, James C. Fye, conceived and **actually** reduced the invention defined by claims 1-28 to practice prior to the earliest effective date of *Dawson* (i.e., July 29, 2003). Therefore, because Applicant conceived and actually reduced the invention defined by claims 1-28 to practice prior to the earliest effective date of *Dawson*, *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Patent Office further relies on the disclosures in *Reitmeier* and *Miyazaki* to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*; however, Applicant submits that *Reitmeier* and/or *Miyazaki* fail to cure such defects.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not cite *Reitmeier* and/or *Miyazaki* as teaching or suggesting the elements of: “receiving second video data from a second video source at a second video decoder via a second video channel,” “decoding, via the first video decoder, a first frame of the first video data,” “decoding, via the second video decoder, a second frame of the second video data,” “inputting the first decoded frame into a first video processing pipeline via a non-blocking switch network,” and “inputting the second decoded frame into a second video processing pipeline via the non-blocking switch network,” as recited in claim 14. Moreover, in reviewing *Reitmeier* and *Miyazaki*, both individually and collectively, Applicant is unable to discern any sections in *Reitmeier* and/or *Miyazaki* teaching or suggesting such elements. Therefore, *Reitmeier* and/or *Miyazaki* fail to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*.

The failure of the cited references to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 14 is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Therefore, claim 14 is not obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14.

F. Claims 15-18

Claims 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Machida* in view of *Dawson*, *Reitmeier*, *Miyazaki*, and U.S. Patent No. 6,456,335 issued to Miura et al. (“*Miura*”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and include all of the elements thereof. In rejecting claim 14 the Patent Office characterizes *Machida*, *Dawson*, *Reitmeier*, and *Miyazaki* similar to the rejection of claim 14 discussed above. Applicant has discussed the failure of the combination of *Machida*, *Reitmeier*, and *Miyazaki* to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 14, and that *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and respectfully submits that such discussion is equally applicable to claims 15-18 because of their respective dependencies from claim 14. The Patent Office relies on the disclosure in *Miura* to cure the defects of *Machida*, *Reitmeier*, and *Miyazaki*; however, Applicant submits that *Miura* fails to cure such defects.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not cite *Miura* as teaching or suggesting the elements of: “receiving second video data from a second video source at a second video decoder via a second video channel,” “decoding, via the first video decoder, a first frame of the first video data,” “decoding, via the second video decoder, a second frame of the second video data,” “inputting the first decoded frame into a first video processing pipeline via a non-blocking switch network,” and “inputting the second decoded frame into a second video processing pipeline via the non-blocking switch network,” as recited in claims 15-18 (via claim 14). Moreover, in reviewing *Miura*, Applicant is unable to discern any sections in *Miura* disclosing such elements. Therefore, *Miura* fails to cure the defects of *Machida*, *Dawson*, *Reitmeier*, and *Miyazaki*.

The failure of the cited references to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 15-18 is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Therefore, claims 15-18 are not obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-18.

G. Claims 23-25

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Machida* in view of *Dawson* and *Miura*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 23-25 depend from independent claim 19 and include all of the elements thereof. In rejecting claims 23-25, the Patent Office characterizes *Machida* and *Dawson* similar to the rejection of claim 19 discussed above. Applicant has discussed the failure of *Machida* to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 19, and that *Dawson* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and respectfully submits that such discussion is equally applicable to claims 23-25 because of their respective dependencies from claim 19. The Patent Office relies on the disclosure in *Miura* to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*; however, Applicant submits that *Miura* fails to cure such defects.

In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not cite *Miura* as teaching or suggesting the elements of: “a plurality of video sources,” “a plurality of video channels coupled to the plurality of

Application No.: 10/699,311
Reply to Office Action mailed on 7/8/2009
Reply dated 8/17/2009

video sources, wherein each of the plurality of video sources is configured to transmit first video data to a different one of the plurality of video channels,” as recited in claim 19. Moreover, in reviewing *Miura* Applicant is unable to discern any sections of *Miura* teaching or suggesting such elements. Therefore, *Miura* fails to cure the defects of *Machida* and *Dawson*.

The failure of the cited references to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 23-25 is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Therefore, claims 23-25 are not obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23-25.

III. Claim Amendments

Applicants amend claims 20-23 and 27 so that various features recited in claims 20-23 and 27 are consistent with the amendments to independent claim 19.

Application No.: 10/699,311
Reply to Office Action mailed on 7/8/2009
Reply dated 8/17/2009

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (480) 385-5060 or jgraff@ifllaw.com.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LROENZ

Date: August 17, 2009

By: /JASON R. GRAFF, REG. NO. 54,134/
Jason R. Graff, Reg. No. 54,134
Attorney for Applicant

Enclosures: 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 declaration